



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/666,601

09/18/2003

Hurbert Lobo

MA1-2

8543

20808

7590

09/22/2006

BROWN & MICHAELS, PC
400 M & T BANK BUILDING
118 NORTH TIOGA ST
ITHACA, NY 14850

EXAMINER

LOVEL, KIMBERLY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/666,601	Applicant(s) LOBO ET AL.	
	Examiner Kimberly Lovel	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 12-38 and 47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 26 June 2006.
2. Claims 1-4, 12-38 and 47 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 15 are independent. In the Amendment filed 26 June 2006, claims 5-11 and 39-46 have been cancelled and claims 1-4, 12-15, 17-20, 34, 37 and 38 have been amended. Since the amendments to the independent claims changed the scope of the claims, this action is made Final.
3. The rejections of claims 1-4 and 13-14 as being anticipated by US PGPub 2005/0131861 to Arritt et al; of claim 12 as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2005/0131861 to Arritt et al in view of the dissertation titled "Pulsed DC Reactive Magnetron Sputtering of Aluminum Nitride Thin Films" by Jung Won Cho; of claims 15-19, 21-26, 28-30, 34-38 and 47 as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2005/0131861 to Arritt et al in view of US PGPub 2003/0069795 to Boyd et al; and of claims 27 and 31-33 as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2005/0131861 to Arritt et al in view of US PGPub 2003/0069795 to Boyd et al, further in view of US Patent No 6,484,173 to O'Hare et al have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

4. The objections to the drawings have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment and applicants' arguments.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because the specification on page 8, line 11 mentions that a Table 1 follows. However, Table 1 is never displayed.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 13 and 15 are objected to because of the claims recite the limitation "the depository" in lines 2 and part c, line 2 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. The rejections to the claims have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2167

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1-4 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2005/0131861 to Arritt et al in view of the dissertation titled "Pulsed DC Reactive Magnetron Sputtering of Aluminum Nitride Thin Films" by Jung Won Cho (hereafter Cho).

Referring to claim 1, Arritt et al disclose a repository of material property data comprising a plurality of materials property datasets stored in a computer memory, each dataset being associated with a sample of a material and a test on the sample of the material [tracking/monitoring of samples through multiple testing areas] (see [0022]), each dataset comprising:

a) a metadata database [portion of the database 10 dealing with the material, sample and the test] in the form of instances with associated metadata giving information about the instances [the database is populated] (see Fig 5, item 93), the

Art Unit: 2167

metadata comprising at least one data element selected from a list comprising name, description, identifying information [material code, sample identity, operator who performed the test], data type, units, acceptable values or ranges, and default value, the database comprising:

- i) metadata on the material [material code] (see [0025], lines 1-3);
 - ii) metadata on the sample [sample identity] (see [0024], lines 12-19);
 - iii) metadata on the test [operator who performed the test] (see [0034], lines 3-6 and [0037], lines 1-9);
 - iv) metadata on data value elements in the result database [data measured by the instrumentation] (see [0037], lines 1-3); and
- b) a test result database [the portion of the database dealing testing the sample] comprising a plurality of instances having associated metadata in the metadata database giving information about the instance [the database is populated] (see Fig 5, item 93), the instances comprising information about at least one result derived from the test on the sample of the material [data measured by the instrumentation] (see [0037], lines 1-3), each instance comprising:
- i) at least one data element identifying at least one of material, the sample or the test [the operator who operated the instrument for testing the sample] (see [0034], lines 3-6 and [0037], lines 1-9)

wherein the metadata in the metadata database define the instances in the metadata database and the instances of test result information in the test result

Art Unit: 2167

database [material code and the operator who performed the test are considered to represent] (see [0025], lines 1-3 and [0037], lines 1-9), and

wherein an instance from the test result database, combined with its associated metadata from the metadata database describes the test result derived from the test on the sample of the material [material code and the operator who performed the test are considered to represent] (see [0025], lines 1-3 and [0037], lines 1-9).

However, Arritt et al fail to explicitly disclose the further limitation of each instance comprising at least one data value element selected from a list comprising a single data point, an equation, a graph, a data array and a picture. Cho discloses the setup and execution of an experiment on a sample of a material in which the information is stored in the form of instances with associated metadata (see page 36, Table 1-2 – the instances are represented by the type of Crystal and the measurement values and the metadata are Crystal and the units of measurement), including the further limitation of each instance comprising at least one data value element selected from a list comprising a single data point, an equation, a graph, a data array and a picture (see page 153, Table 5.3 – the results of ohmic heating for 10 mT Ar plasma, 0.25 A is 10.8 which is considered to represent a single data point).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Cho's display of tables of results of tests of a sample as tables located in the repository of Arritt et al. One would have been motivated to do so in order to display examples of the information located in the repository of Arritt et al (Arritt et al: see [0010]).

Referring to claim 2, the combination of Arritt et al and Cho (hereafter Arritt/Cho) discloses the repository of claim 1, in which the data element of claim 1(b)i on the material comprises at least one data element selected from a list comprising material name, material class, one or more material subclasses, material supplier (Arritt et al: see [0029], line 12), and material composition for composite materials.

Referring to claim 3, Arritt/Cho discloses the repository of claim 1, in which the data element of claim 1(b)ii on the sample comprises at least one data element selected from a list comprising a sample identification, a sample description, a sample size, a sample source and a sample type (Arritt et al: see [0024], lines 12-19 – *sample identification, sample source and sample type*).

Referring to claim 4, Arritt/Cho discloses the repository of claim 1, in which the data element 1(b)(iii) on the test comprises at least one data element selected from a list comprising a description of test method, test parameters, and test source information (Arritt et al: see [0037], lines 1-9 and [0024], lines 4-5 – the operator's name and department affiliation are considered to represent *test source information*; the identity of the instrument is considered to also represent *test source information*).

Referring to claim 12, Arritt/Cho discloses the repository of claim 1, in which results that share common defining parameters are grouped to display the effect of the defining parameters on the result (Cho: see page 151, Table 5-2 – the defining parameters are 10mT of Ar plasma and 28mT of Ar/N2 mixture).

Referring to claim 13, Arritt/Cho discloses the repository of claim 1, further comprising information about users [operator] of the depository (Arritt et al: see [0027]).

Referring to claim 14, Arritt et al disclose the repository of claim 13, in the users about whom information is stored in the customer database comprise at least owners, users and providers of material property datasets in the repository (Arritt et al: see [0027] – tables of the database contain information about the operator).

10. Claims 15-19, 21-26, 28-30, 34-38, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2005/0131861 to Arritt et al in view of the dissertation titled “Pulsed DC Reactive Magnetron Sputtering of Aluminum Nitride Thin Films” by Jung Won Cho in view of US PGPub 2003/0069795 to Boyd et al (hereafter Boyd et al).

Referring to claim 15, Arritt et al disclose a method of managing material property data. In particular, Arritt et al disclose a method of managing material property data comprising the steps of:

a) storing material property data in a repository stored in a computer memory comprising a plurality of materials property datasets (see [0010]), each dataset:

i) being created by a data provider [the operator of the instrumentation] (see [0035]-[0037]);

iii) being associated with a sample of a material and a test on the sample of the material (see [0010] and [0024], lines 12-19); and

iv) comprising:

a) a metadata database [portion of the database 10 dealing with the material, sample and the test] in the form of instances with associated metadata giving

Art Unit: 2167

information about the instances [the database is populated] (see Fig 5, item 93), the metadata comprising at least one data element selected from a list comprising name, description, identifying information [material code, sample identity, operator who performed the test], data type, units, acceptable values or ranges, and default value, the database comprising:

- 1) metadata on the material [material code] (see [0025], lines 1-3);
- 2) metadata on the sample [sample identity] (see [0024], lines 12-19);
- 3) metadata on the test [operator who performed the test] (see [0034], lines 3-6 and [0037], lines 1-9);

- 4) metadata on data value elements in the result database [data measured by the instrumentation] (see [0037], lines 1-3); and

b) a test result database [the portion of the database dealing testing the sample] comprising a plurality of instances having associated metadata in the metadata database giving information about the instance [the database is populated] (see Fig 5, item 93), the instances comprising information about at least one result derived from the test on the sample of the material [data measured by the instrumentation] (see [0037], lines 1-3), each instance comprising:

- 1) at least one data element identifying at least one of material, the sample or the test [the operator who operated the instrument for testing the sample] (see [0034], lines 3-6 and [0037], lines 1-9);

wherein the metadata in the metadata database define the instances in the metadata database and the instances of test result information in the test result

database [material code and the operator who performed the test are considered to represent] (see [0025], lines 1-3 and [0037], lines 1-9), and

wherein an instance from the test result database, combined with its associated metadata from the metadata database describes the test result derived from the test on the sample of the material [material code and the operator who performed the test are considered to represent] (see [0025], lines 1-3 and [0037], lines 1-9).

However, Arritt et al fail to explicitly disclose the further limitation of each instance comprising at least one data value element selected from a list comprising a single data point, an equation, a graph, a data array and a picture. Cho discloses the setup and execution of an experiment on a sample of a material in which the information is stored in the form of instances with associated metadata (see page 36, Table 1-2 – the instances are represented by the type of Crystal and the measurement values and the metadata are Crystal and the units of measurement), including the further limitation of each instance comprising at least one data value element selected from a list comprising a single data point, an equation, a graph, a data array and a picture (see page 153, Table 5.3 – the results of ohmic heating for 10 mT Ar plasma, 0.25 A is 10.8 which is considered to represent a single data point).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Cho's display of tables of results of tests of a sample as tables located in the repository of Arritt et al. One would have been motivated to do so in order to display examples of the information located in the repository of Arritt et al (Arritt et al: see [0010]).

Furthermore, Arritt/Cho does not explicitly teach the further limitations of (a) wherein each dataset has at least one owner; of (b), of (c) or (d). Boyd et al teach a supplier data management system for materials including a database (see abstract). In particular, Boyd discloses

a) storing material property data in a repository comprising a plurality of materials property datasets (see [0009] and [0021]), each dataset:

ii) having at least one owner (see [0021]-[0023] – the raw material supplier is considered to represent the *data owner*);

c) a customer database [manufacturers database] (see [0021], lines 5-8), comprising information about users of the depository, the users about whom information is stored in the customer database comprise at least owners, users and providers of information in the repository (see [0022]);

b) providing at least one data owner with access to at least one dataset in the repository (see [0022] – the supplier has access to the data on the particular materials which they supply);

c) providing at least one data user with access to at least one dataset in the repository (see [0009] – the manufacturer is considered to represent the *data user*); and

d) displaying information from at least one dataset stored in step (a) and accessed by the user in step (c) on a display [Web page display] (see [0046]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use database of Arritt/Cho as a subcomponent to Boyd et al's method of managing supplier data. One would have been motivated to do so in order to

Art Unit: 2167

decrease the difficulties of tracking the components of the materials (Arritt et al: see [0005]-[0007]).

Referring to claim 16, the combination of Arritt/Cho and Boyd et al (hereafter Arritt/Cho/Boyd) teaches the method of claim 15; in which the materials property datasets are created by the data provider by the steps of:

specifying generic information about the material including at least one of the class, subclass, terms that are commonly associated with the material, notes about the material (Boyd et al: see [0022] and [0024] – raw material properties, batch information, information about shipping, material ID), generic physical attributes such as shape and form, the component materials of the material and their relationship within the material;

performing preliminary validation checks as to whether the information for the material already exists (Boyd et al: see [0024] – each raw material consists of one code which allows for a validation check to see if information has previously entered);

perform preliminary validation checks regarding the structure of the data (Boyd et al: see [0024], lines 9-13);

if the dataset passes the checks, entering the dataset into the repository (Boyd et al: see [0024]).

Referring to claim 17, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 16, in which the data provider specifies the dataset by submitting datasets, each of which represent the results of the measurements (Boyd et al: see [0021], lines 5-16).

Referring to claim 18, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 17, in which the datasets are submitted interactively using a form over a computer network (Boyd et al: see [0021], lines 5-12 – a spreadsheet).

Referring to claim 19, Arritt/Boyd teaches the method of claim 17, in which the datasets are submitted from a computer program (Boyd et al: see [0021]; Fig 1, item 26; and Fig 2, item 10).

Referring to claim 21, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 15, in which the information on the material in at least one dataset further comprises a nomenclature of the material, and the dataset further comprises an identification of a material vendor, the method further comprising the step of providing the material vendor with access to the dataset for maintenance of the nomenclature (Boyd et al: see [0009] – the supplier transmits the raw materials property data to the database of the manufacturer).

Referring to claim 22, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 21, in which the nomenclature is selected from a list comprising class, sub-class and general physical attributes (Boyd et al: see [0019], lines 7-13).

Referring to claim 23, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 15, in which the step of providing the data owner with access to at least one dataset in the repository comprises the steps of:

presenting the data owners with a list summarizing the data that they own, each item in the list possessing sufficient information for the owner to identify the property, the information being at least one of the name of the material, the name of the property, the date of measurement, identification of the specimen sample as obtained

from the data provider and an identification of the test as obtained from the data provider (Boyd et al: see [0022], lines 17-19); and

presenting the owner is with a hyperlink which would lead to the display of an overview and details of all results of the test (Boyd et al: see [0022], lines 12-15 – the user selects the material type from the menu).

Referring to claim 24, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 23, further comprising the step of allowing the owner to narrow down the list to data which represent the same test or property data for the same sample (Boyd et al: see [0023] – selecting which specification to use when there is more than one is considered to represent narrowing down the data by property data for the same sample).

Referring to claim 25, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 15, in which the step of providing the data user with access to at least one dataset in the repository comprises the steps of:

allowing the user to indicate any requirements on class, subclasses or suppliers of material (Arritt et al: see [0027]);

allowing the user to indicate properties sought (Arritt et al: see [0027]);

presenting a set of materials with their properties (Arritt et al: see [0027]);

allowing the user to select at least one material and property from the set (Arritt et al: see [0027]); and

displaying a summary and details of the set of datasets for the specified material and property (Arritt et al: see [0039] – a generated report).

Referring to claim 26, Arritt/Cho/Boyd discloses the method of claim 15, in which at least some of the datasets in the repository further comprise data representing permitted user access privileges, and the step of providing a user with access to the repository comprises the step of comparing the user's access privileges to the data representing permitted user access privileges, and denying access to a dataset if the user's access privileges are not sufficient to access the dataset (Boyd et al: see [0022] – the user enters their identifying ID and password and then is only shown data in which the ID matches the requirements).

Referring to claim 28, Arritt/Cho/Boyd discloses the method of claim 15, in which the step of providing the data user with access to at least one dataset in the repository comprises the steps of:

- allowing the user to indicate any requirements on class, subclasses or suppliers of material (Arritt et al: see [0027]);

- allowing the user to indicate restrictions on values of results (Arritt et al: see [0027]);

- presenting a set of materials with their properties which conform to the restrictions (Arritt et al: see [0027]);

- allowing the user to select at least one material and property from the set (Arritt et al: see [0027]); and

- displaying a summary and details of the set of datasets for the specified material and property (Arritt et al: see [0039] – a generated report).

Referring to claim 29, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 15, in which the step of providing the data user with access comprises the step of providing data in a format which is understandable by a selected computer program or application (Boyd et al: see [0031]).

Referring to claim 30, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 29, in which the repository further stores information describing the format which is understandable by a selected computer program or application (Boyd et al: see [0031]).

Referring to claim 34, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 15, in which the data element of claim 15(a)(iv)(a)(1) on the material comprises at least one data element selected from a list comprising material name, material class, one or more material subclasses, material supplier (Arritt et al: see [0029], line 12), and material composition for composite materials.

Referring to claim 35, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 15, in which a data life cycle of at least one dataset is controlled by the step of permitting at least one user to activate, inactivate, deprecate and discard the dataset (Arritt et al: see [0023] and [0027]).

Referring to claim 36, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 35, further comprising the step of providing any user with a review of any active dataset upon request (Arritt et al: see [0027]).

Referring to claim 37, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 15, in which the data element of claim 15(a)(iv)(a)(2) on the sample comprises at least one data element selected from a list comprising a sample identification, a sample description, a

sample size, a sample source and a sample type (Arritt et al: see [0024], lines 12-19 – *sample identification, sample source and sample type*).

Referring to claim 38, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 15, in which the data element of claim 15(a)(iv)(a)(3) on the test comprises at least one data element selected from a list comprising a description of test method, a standards body specifying the test, test parameters, and test source information (Arritt et al: see [0037], lines 1-9 and [0024], lines 4-5 – the operator's name and department affiliation are considered to represent *test source information*; the identity of the instrument is considered to also represent *test source information*).

Referring to claim 47, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches the method of claim 15, further comprising the step of providing at least one data owner with means to monitor usage of at least one dataset (Boyd et al: see [0022] – the network and the interface provides the means).

11. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2005/0131861 to Arritt et al in view of the dissertation titled "Pulsed DC Reactive Magnetron Sputtering of Aluminum Nitride Thin Films" by Jung Won Cho in view of US PGPub 2003/0069795 to Boyd et al as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of US PGPub 2004/0243580 to Markki et al (hereafter Markki et al).

Referring to claim 20, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches a method in which documents are submitted by the computer program using SOAP protocol. However, Arritt/Cho/Boyd fails to explicitly teach the further limitation in which the documents are

submitted by the computer program using SOAP protocol. Markki et al teach a method of submitting documents, including the further limitation. In particular, Markki et al teach a method similar to that of claim 19, in which the documents are submitted by the computer program using SOAP protocol (Markki et al: see [0169]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Markki et al's method of submitting documents using SOAP protocol with Arritt/Cho/Boyd's method for submitting documents as a precautionary measure. One would have been motivated to do so in order to reduce the amount of required overhead and additional software (Arritt et al: see [0007]).

12. Claims 27 and 31-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2005/0131861 to Arritt et al in view of the dissertation titled "Pulsed DC Reactive Magnetron Sputtering of Aluminum Nitride Thin Films" by Jung Won Cho in view of US PGPub 2003/0069795 to Boyd et al as applied respectively to claims 26 and 15 above, and further in view of US Patent No 6,484,173 to O'Hare et al (hereafter O'Hare et al).

Referring to claim 27, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teach a method in which at least some of the datasets in the repository further comprise data representing permitted user access privileges, and the step of providing a user with access to the repository comprises the step of comparing the user's access privileges to the data representing permitted user access privileges, and denying access to a dataset if the user's access privileges are not sufficient to access the dataset. However, Arritt/Cho/Boyd fails to explicitly teach

Art Unit: 2167

the further limitations of presenting the user with a form to request access to the dataset, accepting the form from the user, notifying the data owner of the request for access, along with basic identification and contact information about the requesting user, allowing the data owner to accept or reject the request and if the data owner accepts the request, updating the data access privileges in the dataset to permit access by the user. O'Hare et al teaches a method for controlling access to a storage device (see abstract). In particular, O'Hare et al teach a method similar to that of claim 26, further comprising the steps, after the step of denying access, of:

- presenting the user with a form to request access to the dataset (see column 3, lines 23-47 – the screen to enter user ID and password is considered to represent the form);

- accepting the form from the user (see column 3, lines 23-47);

- notifying the data owner of the request for access, along with basic identification and contact information about the requesting user;

- allowing the data owner to accept or reject the request (see column 2, lines 50-67 and column 3, lines 23-47);

- if the data owner accepts the request, updating the data access privileges in the dataset to permit access by the user (see column 2, lines 31-35 and column 3, lines 23-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use O'Hare et al's method of controlling access to a storage device with the management system of Arritt/Cho/Boyd. One would have been

motivated to do so in order to limit user access and increase the security of the information stored in the database (Boyd et al: see [0008], lines 11-17).

Referring to claim 31, Arritt/Cho/Boyd teaches a method for managing material property data. However, Arritt/Cho/Boyd fails to explicitly teach the further limitation of in which there are a plurality of data users and a plurality of domains, and at least one domain administrator associated with at least one domain, and the method further comprises the steps of: the domain administrator assigning at least some of the plurality of users to at least one domain, the domain administrator setting policies for access of at least one dataset by the users assigned to the domain. O'Hare et al teach a method for controlling access to a storage device (see abstract). In particular, O'Hare et al disclose a method similar to that of claim 15, in which there are a plurality of data users and a plurality of domains, and at least one domain administrator associated with at least one domain, and the method further comprises the steps of:

the domain administrator assigning at least some of the plurality of users to at least one domain (O'Hare et al: see column 10, lines 41-56),

the domain administrator setting policies for access of at least one dataset by the users assigned to the domain (O'Hare et al: see column 10, lines 41-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use O'Hare et al's method of controlling access to a storage device with the management system of Arritt/Cho/Boyd. One would have been motivated to do so in order to limit user access and increase the security of the information stored in the database (Boyd et al: see [0008], lines 11-17).

Referring to claim 32, the combination Arritt/Cho/Boyd and O'Hare et al (hereafter Arritt/Cho/Boyd/O'Hare) teaches the method of claim 31, in which the domains are a company or a division of the company (O'Hare et al: see column 10, lines 41-56 – a workgroup is considered to represent a division of a company).

Referring to claim 33, Arritt/Cho/Boyd/O'Hare teaches the method of claim 31, further comprising the step of permitting the domain administrator to assign at least one domain to at least one other domain (O'Hare et al: see column 10, lines 41-56).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 12-38 and 47 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

14. However, Applicant's argument regarding claim 1 with reference to Arritt et al has been fully considered but they is not persuasive.

Referring to applicant's remarks on page 19 regarding the rejection of claim 1: Applicants' argued that "Arritt's application explicitly describes a plurality of database tables, and does not teach or suggest the use of a single results database with a separate associated metadata database."

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the use of a single results database with a separate associated metadata database) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in

light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US PGPub 2003/0217037 to Bicker et al discloses a results database separate from a product database.

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Lovel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

11 September 2006
kml


JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


15 September 2006